



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

VOL. LIX.

BOSTON, MAY, 1897.

No. 5

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,  
PUBLISHERS,  
NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIALS . . . . .	101-103
The Arbitration Treaty—The Grant Monument Dedication—The Graeco-Turkish Conflict.	
EDITORIAL NOTES . . . . .	104-110
Annual Meeting American Peace Society—Translation of Eternal Peace—Geneva Award Fund—Arbitration with Mexico—Ex-Secretary Olney—Peace Movement in Europe—Queen Victoria—Delagoa Bay—Belgian Parliament—France and Brazil—Federation of Australian Colonies—Austrian Peace Society—An Anglo-Saxon Holiday—Senator Morgan—Great Britain and Venezuela—Behring Sea Commission—Dr. W. Evans Darby—The Church Petition—England and Holland—The Red Cross in Greece—Dr. von Stephan—International Postal Congress—Otto Umfrid—International Monetary Conference—Battleship Iowa—President Angell—Mohonk Arbitration Conference—Secretary Trueblood's Public Work.	
History of the Origin of the Red Cross . . . . .	110
Eternal Peace, <i>Immanuel Kant</i> . . . . .	111
School Histories and International Animositities . . . . .	116

## THE ARBITRATION TREATY.

Senator Davis, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has finally succeeded in getting the Senate to fix May 5th as the date on which the vote on the arbitration treaty is to be taken. As this number of the *ADVOCATE* will be printed before that time, we cannot now announce the result, which is considered still in doubt. A list of thirty-two senators has been made, all of whom it is supposed will vote against the treaty even as amended. If these senators vote as it is predicted that they will, that will be the end of the present treaty. But it will not be the end of the subject. The people of the two countries have set their hearts on having such a treaty, and if this one is voted down, the protest against the course of the senators who kill it will be loud and long, and in a comparatively short time a new treaty will be negotiated on as strong or even stronger lines than the present one.

There are different opinions as to what the treaty will be worth if ratified in its amended form, which it must be now if ratified at all, for it must be voted on in its present shape. In England the nearly universal opinion is that the value of the treaty is absolutely destroyed by the amendments. The hands of the State Department, it is said, would be tied by it, so that the course heretofore pursued in arranging for the arbitration of disputes would be impossible. As the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, which has now largely degenerated into a school of endless debate, would be required to submit any question, it is supposed that thereby the whole course of arbitration would be effectually blocked. This view is also taken by many of the friends of arbitration in this country and they declare that they do not care if the treaty, in its present shape, is voted down. This view has much truth in it, but it is overdrawn. There is no doubt, however, that if the Senate continues its present rule of unlimited debate, a few obstructionists, even half a dozen, would be able to render arbitration under the treaty practically impossible. But the Senate is already discussing the question of changing its rule, and it is certainly possible that our civilization may be able yet to slough off the contingent of "honorable men," "all honorable men," whose irrational opposition to this treaty has been so disgusting and humiliating to the great body of our citizens.

But there is another view which has quite as much point as this. If the treaty is ratified in its amended form, the two governments will have thereby officially adopted, severally and jointly, the principle of arbitration as the proper method of settling their controversies. They will also have adopted with it a system for the practical carrying out of the principle as disputes arise. This will be unquestionably an advance of great value to the cause of arbitration. It is not at all likely that under the agreement the power given to the Senate would be used, save in exceptional cases, to defeat the end at which the treaty aims. In the case of all ordinary questions, such as have been most usually arbitrated between governments, the matter of obtaining the consent of the Senate would be a

mere formality. It must be remembered too that a large majority of the Senate as at present constituted are in favor of the treaty, a number of them preferring no amendment. If the treaty should be ratified, it is reasonable to suppose that the Senate as a whole, feeling the responsibility which its own action in amending the treaty will have laid upon it, and satisfied with having preserved to itself what it considers one of the most important of its prerogatives, will be even less disposed to delay an arbitration proposed by the President than has been the case in the past. This view, it seems to us, is much the more rational one. It is always best to take all the ground that it is possible to win and hold it. Even if the treaty should prove much less valuable in practice than this view supposes, it will be at least an immense step forward that the two governments have solemnly agreed to adopt between them the principle of general arbitration for disputes which may arise. All the rest will come in time, for reforms do not go backward.

If the treaty should fail entirely, it may be a very serious blow to the cause of arbitration in other countries, where its friends are accustomed to use as one of their most powerful means of propaganda the example of the United States. Our country has already suffered seriously in the estimation of the citizens of other countries on account of the opposition to the treaty in the Senate. A nation is always judged by the acts of its government, and the Senate in this instance is a part of the government. The majority of men will not and often cannot go back of a government to find out what the people really think. We have always judged Great Britain, unjustly to be sure but really, by the course of her government during our Civil War, not by the actual feelings and wishes of the English people, whom the government did not represent. It will be the same in the case before us. If the treaty fails, the injury which our country will thereby have done to a cause which it has always been loud in pretending to uphold, can be repaired and will be, but it cannot be done in a day. The spirit of the thirty men in the Senate will be transferred to the whole nation, and we shall have "hypocritical" and "pretentious" written over our national doors, and our reputation for love of right and truth and for progress in all that elevates and blesses humanity will be seriously stained.

#### THE GRANT MONUMENT DEDICATION.

All American citizens honor the memory of President Grant and have wished him to have a suitable monument. Even those who do not believe in war see much in him which they would be false to themselves if they did not admire intensely as well as sincerely. General Grant, though a stern and unyielding fighter and the greatest general that our country has ever produced, was not in character a military man at all, in the professional sense

of the term, paradoxical as this statement may seem. War he looked upon only as the direst of necessities, to be laid at once and absolutely aside when its immediate purpose was accomplished. The spirit of the professional militarist who sees in war a means of personal preferment and of glory to the nation was to him a grewsome and disgusting spirit.

All of us remember with feelings of the highest admiration Grant's generosity toward the conquered army and the General who surrendered to him at Appomattox. There was no stage-playing in this; it was the sincerest expression of his nature. "Each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home, *not to be disturbed by United States authority* so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they reside." Those were the terms which he dictated, which grew out of his feeling that there should be no vindictive policy toward the South, and which he always afterwards, when others were clamoring for the heads of a lot of the Southern men, insisted that the government should faithfully adhere to. "Let us have peace" will remain one of the last quoted of all Grant's sayings.

Grant's connection with the Treaty of Washington which brought about the settlement of the Alabama claims,—a treaty which could never have come into existence without his hearty coöperation as President—will cause his name always to be mentioned with the highest regard by the friends of international concord. In an interview with some of the friends of peace at Philadelphia General Grant once said: "Though I have been trained as a soldier and have participated in many battles there never was a time when, in my opinion, some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. I look forward to an epoch when a court recognized by all nations will settle international differences instead of keeping large standing armies, as they do in Europe." In 1884 he wrote to a meeting in Philadelphia, presided over by Bishop Simpson: "My views on the subject of peaceful arbitration in the settlement of international differences instead of the sword have not changed. It is only by keeping the subject alive, however, that it can be accomplished." On his journey round the world, when asked to act as umpire in a dispute between China and Japan, he said to the Chinese Minister, Prince Kung: "An arbitration between two nations may not satisfy either party at the time, but it satisfies the conscience of mankind, and must commend itself more and more as a means of adjusting disputes. The world is becoming civilized and learning that there is a better way to settle difficulties than by fighting." Previously at Birmingham, England, in reply to an address from the Arbitration Union of that city, he gave utterance to similar sentiments: "Though I have followed a military life for the better part of my years, there was never a day of my